

[Roll No. 857]

YEAS—287

Abercrombie Franks (CT) Montgomery
 Allard Franks (NJ) Moorhead
 Andrews Frelinghuysen Morella
 Archer Frisa Myrick
 Arney Funderburk Nethercutt
 Bachus Gallegly Neumann
 Baker (CA) Ganske Ney
 Baker (LA) Gekas Norwood
 Baldacci Geren Nussle
 Ballenger Gilchrist Ortiz
 Barcia Gillmor Oxley
 Barrett (NE) Gilman Packard
 Bartlett Gingrich Parker
 Barton Gonzalez Paxon
 Bass Goodlatte Payne (VA)
 Bentsen Goodling Peterson (MN)
 Bereuter Gordon Pombo
 Bilbray Goss Porter
 Billirakis Graham Portman
 Bishop Pryce Conyers
 Bliley Greenwood Quinn
 Blute Gunderson Radanovich
 Boehlert Gutknecht Ramstad
 Boehner Hall (TX) Regula
 Bonilla Hancock Riggs
 Bono Hansen Rivers
 Brewster Hastert Roberts
 Browder Hastings (WA) Roemer
 Brownback Hayes Rogers
 Bryant (TN) Hayworth Ros-Lehtinen
 Bryant (TX) Hefley Roth
 Bunn Heineman Roukema
 Bunning Herger Royce
 Burr Hilleary Salmon
 Burton Hobson Sanders
 Buyer Hoekstra Sanford
 Callahan Holden Saxton
 Calvert Horn Schaefer
 Camp Hostettler Schiff
 Canady Hunter Schroeder
 Castle Hutchinson Schumer
 Chabot Hyde Seastrand
 Chambliss Inglis Sensenbrenner
 Chapman Istook Serrano
 Chenoweth Jacobs Shadegg
 Christensen Jefferson Shaw
 Chrysler Johnson (CT) Shays
 Clinger Johnson (SD) Shuster
 Coble Johnson, Sam Skeen
 Coburn Jones Skelton
 Collins (GA) Kaptur Smith (MI)
 Collins (IL) Kasich Smith (NJ)
 Combust Kelly Smith (TX)
 Condit Kim Smith (WA)
 Cooley King Solomon
 Costello Kingston Souder
 Cox Kleczka Spence
 Cramer Knollenberg Spratt
 Crane Kolbe Stark
 Crapo LaHood Stearns
 Cremeans Largent Stenholm
 Cubin Latham Stockman
 Cunningham LaTourette Stump
 Danner Laughlin Talent
 Davis Lazio Tanner
 de la Garza Leach Tate
 Deal Lewis (CA) Tauzin
 DeFazio Lewis (KY) Taylor (MS)
 DeLay Lightfoot Taylor (NC)
 Dickey Lincoln Tejeda
 Doggett Linder Thomas
 Doolittle Lipinski Thornberry
 Dornan Livingston Thurman
 Doyle LoBiondo Tiahrt
 Dreier Lofgren Torkildsen
 Duncan Longley Traficant
 Dunn Luther Upton
 Durbin Manton Vucanovich
 Edwards Manzullo Waldholtz
 Ehlers Martini Walker
 Ehrlich McCarthy Walsh
 Emerson McCollum Wamp
 English McCrery Watts (OK)
 Ensign McDade Weldon (FL)
 Evans McHale Weldon (PA)
 Everett McHugh Weller
 Ewing McIntosh White
 Fawell McKeon Whitfield
 Fields (LA) McNulty Wicker
 Fields (TX) Menendez Wise
 Filner Metcalf Wolf
 Flanagan Meyers Wyden
 Foley Mica Young (AK)
 Forbes Miller (FL) Young (FL)
 Fowler Minge Zimmer
 Fox Molinari

NAYS—141

Ackerman Hamilton Owens
 Baesler Harman Pallone
 Barr Hastings (FL) Pastor
 Barrett (WI) Hefner Payne (NJ)
 Becerra Hilliard Pelosi
 Beilenson Hinchey Peterson (FL)
 Bernan Hoke Petri
 Bevill Houghton Pickett
 Bonior Hoyer Pomeroy
 Borski Jackson-Lee Poshard
 Boucher Johnson, E. B. Quillen
 Brown (CA) Johnston Rahall
 Brown (FL) Kanjorski Rangel
 Brown (OH) Kennedy (MA) Reed
 Cardin Kennedy (RI) Richardson
 Clay Kennelly Rohrabacher
 Clayton Kildee Rose
 Clement Klink Roybal-Allard
 Clyburn Klug Rush
 Coleman LaFalce Sabo
 Collins (MI) Lantos Sawyer
 Conyers Levin Scarborough
 Coyne Lewis (GA) Scott
 DeLauro Lowey Sisisky
 Dellums Maloney Skaggs
 Deutsch Markey Slaughter
 Diaz-Balart Martinez Stokes
 Dicks Mascara Studds
 Dingell Matsui Stupak
 Dixon McDermott Thompson
 Dooley McKinney Thornton
 Engel Meehan Torres
 Eshoo Meek Torricelli
 Farr Mfume Towns
 Fattah Miller (CA) Vento
 Fazio Mink Visclosky
 Flake Moakley Volkmer
 Foglietta Mollohan Ward
 Ford Moran Waters
 Frank (MA) Murtha Watt (NC)
 Frost Myers Waxman
 Furse Nadler Williams
 Gejdenson Neal Wilson
 Gephardt Oberstar Woolsey
 Gibbons Obey Wynn
 Gutierrez Olver Yates
 Hall (OH) Orton Zeliff

□ 2215

SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING DEPLOYMENT OF ARMED FORCES TO BOSNIA

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 304, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 306) expressing the Sense of the House of Representatives regarding the deployment of United States Armed Forces in Bosnia, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of House Resolution 306 is as follows:

H. RES. 306

Whereas the President of the United States pledged to commit the United States Armed Forces to participate in implementing a peace agreement in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

Whereas the United States hosted Proximity Talks in Dayton, Ohio, from November 1, 1995 through November 21, 1995, for the purpose of allowing the negotiation of a peaceful settlement to the longstanding conflict in the former Yugoslavia;

Whereas the Proximity Talks concluded with the Presidents of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia, and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia initialing a General Framework Agreement for Peace on November 21, 1995;

Whereas the Presidents of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia, and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia have requested a NATO-led implementation force with United States participation and have pledged full cooperation with this force;

Whereas some Members of Congress have questions and concerns about certain aspects of the peace implementation process; and

Whereas the Congress joins the President in wanting to minimize the risks to the United States Armed Forces helping to implement the peace agreement in the former Yugoslavia by ensuring that they have the necessary resources and other support to perform their mission effectively: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States Armed Forces who are carrying out their mission in support of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 304, the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HAMILTON], and the gentleman from New York, [Mr. GILMAN], each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support House Resolution 306. It is a very simple and straightforward resolution. Its purpose is simply to support the troops and to praise them for the work they are doing and will do. It does two things in its operative clause. It gives unequivocal support to the men and women of the United States Armed Forces and praises them for the work that they are doing and will do in support of peace in Bosnia. The resolution is intended to be silent with regard to policy, and the whereas clauses of the resolution merely recite facts. The resolution is intended to be silent with regard to policy, neither for the policy

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bateman

NOT VOTING—4

Lucas Tucker
 McInnis Velazquez

□ 2214

Mr. SCARBOROUGH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I wish unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just considered, and that I may include extraneous material for the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BUNNING). Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 304, it is now in order to consider a resolution offered by the minority leader, or his designee.

nor against it. It recites the historical facts without editorial comment.

The resolution does mention that all Members of this body have questions and concerns about the effort in Bosnia. It emphasizes that we want to do all that we can to minimize the risks to U.S. forces by ensuring that they have the resources necessary to perform their mission. So it only calls for unequivocal support of our troops. With all of the doubts and the questions and uncertainties that exist in this Chamber and in the country with respect to Bosnia, the effort here is to come forward with one certainty. That certainty is that we support the troops.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to speak against this in light of the fact that the last vote passed and it passed overwhelmingly. If this should happen to pass, we would have the most mixed message going out to America possible.

These are nice words. Paraphrasing them, they are pabulum. But we support the troops more than adequately in the previous resolution. We stated more correctly when we speak of their courage and of their professionalism in the previous resolution. This one would have no effect except to confuse the people we represent and of course confuse those wonderful troops that are going to be in Bosnia. I am constrained, Mr. Speaker, to vote against this.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER].

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there has been an issue in my 3 years here that the depth of feeling has been such as there is on this movement into Bosnia. I spoke to a group two Mondays ago and had a senior gentleman walk up to me, a businessman. He said, when the first person dies and comes back in a body bag, it will be because of what we did not do yesterday. I said, what was that? He said, you did not speak out in opposition.

This is a very, very dicey prospect. I have heard Members compare this movement to what happened in Vietnam 20-plus years ago. I said this is not Vietnam. This is Afghanistan. It is much, much more dangerous. This war has been going on since 1389. C.B. Hackworth, the most decorated military officer still alive in this Nation, led a group, he said recently on television, into this very area for 1 year, for 1 year in 1949, and they came out 9 years later.

I honestly listened to the President's speech on this subject with an open mind a couple of Monday nights ago because I had to speak about it on radio the next morning. I thought he gave a good speech, but he always gives a good speech. So the next morning I got up early and I read what he said. It was

much different in black and white than it was on a TV picture tube. What he said essentially was that Americans should be for peace. Are we not? I thought that was inane.

Then he said, we must do this out of respect for NATO. My colleagues, NATO is a very large military bureaucracy with nothing to do. It is looking for something to do. My judgment, it is time to recognize that NATO expired in August 1989. It is time for us to give it a decent burial with full military honors and find a new policy and a new arrangement because the old threats are no longer there.

I read the Hamilton resolution. I understand the purpose of it. But if it is anything different in terms of support for the troops than we just voted for, why does it not say, we support the policy? Why does not the President's own party say, we support the policy? Does anybody support the policy?

It does not say that, but there are fine words in here that would let the President tomorrow draw an inference that indeed we do. It says here that the House unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States Armed Forces carrying out their mission in support of Bosnia. I am absolutely convinced that the President can construe that to mean tomorrow that we support the policy. My colleagues, this is not our time. This is not our place. This is not our war. This is the wrong resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], distinguished whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of emotion on this floor tonight and it is not hard to understand why. The decision to commit troops is one of the toughest decisions any of us will have to make. And none of us takes it lightly.

There comes a time when America—and only America—can lead. Now is one of those times.

For 4 long years, we watched as 250,000 people were killed, 16,000 children were slaughtered, and nearly 3 million people were left homeless in Bosnia.

And through it all, there has been very little reason to hope. But finally, peace is at hand.

Finally, we have a real chance to end the bloodshed. For the first time in 4 years, there is hope in Sarajevo because there is faith in America.

And I, for one, am proud of the fact that American troops are saving lives tonight in Bosnia.

For 220 years we have sent American men and women overseas, not just to defend American interest, but to defend American values. To stand up for freedom and democracy and human rights.

And if those things are not worth defending any more then I do not know what America stands for.

The people of Bosnia are tired of war. They want peace, but they need help to

keep the peace. America is not undertaking this mission alone. But only America can lead it.

As Shimon Peres said from the podium behind me yesterday: Only America can provide the compass and the lantern that the world so desperately needs in Bosnia today.

This century began with bloodshed in Sarajevo. And we have it in our power today to make sure that it does not end with bloodshed in Sarajevo.

I would hate to think that someday, historians will look back on this day and wonder why, when we had a chance to keep the peace in Bosnia, the House of Representatives turned its back and let the killing begin again.

We can avoid that fate here today. I urge my colleagues: support our troops. Support the President. And support this resolution.

□ 2230

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the distinguished minority whip, this resolution is much more or much less, depending on one's point of view, than an expression of support for our troops. As someone in the delegation that just returned from Bosnia last night, I have to say that that trip to that incredibly war-torn region raised more questions in my mind than it answered.

That is the problem with the Hamilton resolution. It glosses over those questions in one more "whereas" clause. Until we honestly address those questions and concerns, I do not see how this House can vote for the Hamilton resolution.

Let me just say what I think are the questions which absolutely need addressing in a forthright manner by every Member of this body. First of all, it is not clear if we have defined that criteria for ending this mission successfully, and I think we all know that an exit date is not an exit strategy.

Second, there is a very real concern in talking to the leaders of these three countries whether they are doing everything at this moment to stop war crimes as they promised to do in Dayton. Just look at the scorched Earth policy that the Croats are carrying out in the areas they promised in Dayton to turn over to the Serbians.

There is also a very real concern whether we will be able to achieve greater equality between the heavily armed Serbian and Croatian forces and their underarmed Bosnian counterparts. That military parity, that greater equality, is absolutely essential to a lasting peace.

Lastly, we are in for an untold open-ended financial commitment here. The American people need to be told the true cost of this peacekeeping mission, all that it entails, including the economic and humanitarian assistance necessary to rebuild Bosnia.

So the Hamilton resolution comes up short. It does not address these questions and concerns. It glosses over them with another "whereas" clause, and the American people deserve better.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, tonight we are defining who America is and who we will be in the 21st century. Clearly we are a blessed Nation, protected on both sides by oceans, rich with natural resources, and, more importantly, rich with the diversity of immigrants driven by their pioneer spirit. But to whom much is given, much must be expected.

The Bosnians have cried out for American involvement for three and a half years, partly because we have more military capability than all the nations of Europe combined. But, far more importantly, they look to us because of our heroic character because they know that it was America's heart that saved Europe's soul; because they know that it was our grandfathers and our fathers who were willing to risk their lives, not for any selfish materialistic cause, but for the noblest of reasons, for the cause of human freedom, democracy, justice, and religious and ethnic tolerance.

It is precisely these same cause that are at stake in Bosnia today. We should not, in fact, we must not, profane the legacy of our grandfathers who saved Europe in World War I, or the legacy of our fathers who saved Europe from fascism in World War II and then set up NATO to prevent a World War III. But we would profane their legacy if we let the affluence and the comfortable security that their sacrifice has brought us weaken our resolve to uphold the principles that still define America.

Heroic leaders do not shrink from their moral instincts because their own personal security is not directly threatened. They act when they know that only they can make a difference. They act, because it is the right and the principled thing to do.

After a quarter of a million people have been slaughtered, 40,000 women have been raped, and 2.8 million people have been driven from their homes, it is the right and the principled thing to do to put a stop to this ethnic cleansing, the slaughter that will clearly continue, unless America shows its heroic character once again.

Our troops are the clear expression of our national heroic character, and that is why we should support them by voting for the Hamilton resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

(Mr. PACKARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from Bosnia and having met with each of the three Presidents and many of the other leaders of the

different factions there, I came away convinced that the leaders do not understand the peace agreement, the Dayton accord, the same way. Each of them looks at it differently. There are serious misunderstandings among the leaders that put their initials on the accord and will be signed perhaps tomorrow.

Those differences are major and significant differences. If they exist among the leaders, they surely will exist among the people. The expectations of the people and the leaders there of the United States is that we will be much more involved in the cost, the payment, and the providing of different activities than what the peace accord calls for.

Some of them feel that we will be responsible as Americans to pay for many things that we have no responsibility to do. The refugees, the rebuilding, the building of the infrastructure, the paying for the free elections and for the many commissions that this peace accord calls for, they expect the American people, the American taxpayers, to support all of these functions. Yet that is not the intent of the accord and the American people are not expected to do so.

These confusing understandings from the leaders are not going to lead to a peaceful condition there. I foresee that peace will not come to that region, with or without the American troops. I do not understand how they can have peace with the feelings that they have. There are some that are today rejecting the peace accord.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is a tragedy and a mistake for us to send troops there. I do not support the President's policy. This resolution implies support of the President's policy.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 4 years, we have witnessed systematic ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia. The United States and its allies have done precious little. It is an outrage to humanity that Europe and the United States stood on the sidelines, watching the aggressors willfully violate international standards of human rights.

It can be argued that it is too late to help the people of Bosnia. That Sarajevo lies in rubble. That Europe is primarily to blame for the failure to act. That the United States should have exercised its leadership earlier. In my opinion, all of these concerns are true.

However, it is never too late to act to stop human atrocities. President Clinton deserves the international community's appreciation for bringing the warring parties together.

Although all of us hope these recent peace efforts will succeed, I have serious questions about this NATO mission. The territorial boundaries that have been agreed upon lack historical confidence. The will of the leadership in the former Yugoslavia for peace is uncertain. Yet, this agreement presents the only

hope for peace and an end to the massive human rights abuses.

There are those who believe that we have no national interest in Bosnia. I disagree. Stability in the Balkans is important to a stable Europe and a stable Europe is important to the economic and security interests of the United States. It is also in the national interest to speak loudly against the continuation of ethnic cleansing.

Others say correctly that the United States cannot act in all parts of the world when human rights are violated. However, that should not be a justification for failing to act when we can.

Mr. Speaker, I have serious reservations about the military strategy of this mission. I am concerned as to whether the time table is reasonable and as to whether we can achieve peace. I am disappointed that the President has chosen not to precede under the war powers act, to seek congressional approval to send our troops to a foreign hostile area.

In addition, the house leadership has regrettably failed to allow us to consider a resolution, similar to what is being considered by the other body, which speaks to an appropriate exit policy. An appropriate exit policy clearly would ensure the arming and training of the Bosnian Moslems, the primary victims of aggression. It is imperative for NATO forces to exit the region with the Bosnian Moslems adequately prepared and knowing that a long-term NATO presence is not necessary because there is an equal military balance among the formerly warring factions.

However, the three resolutions that are before us today do not speak to these military concerns. Therefore, I voted against the rule in which these resolutions were made in order.

It is clear from court decisions that the President has the constitutional authority to commit U.S. troops to this mission. All of us, regardless of our views as to whether the President should commit the United States to the NATO implementation force, stand behind our troops, therefore, the only resolution that I can support is the Hamilton resolution which speaks to the support of our troops and points out concerns raised by Members.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Members before voting take their responsibility seriously enough to read the Hamilton resolution. The Hamilton resolution states where we are. It states that the President has committed the troops. This House has refused to cut off the funding to place troops in the field by failing to support the Dornan resolution, the Dornan legislation, and so today before us the only solid support for the troops in the field comes from the Hamilton resolution.

Now, there are debates about the policy. I for one think the policy has succeeded to date. The fighting has stopped, America has used its air power, as many argued that it could not, to bring the sides to the peace table. The President brought them to the United States and to Ohio, and achieved a ceasefire.

All of us are concerned about casualties. That is the only question that remains. If the Congress, House, and Senate, wanted not to send troops to Bosnia, they needed to vote to cut off the funding to make sure no troops would go there. In the Senate that was rejected some 70 votes to less than 30. In the House it was rejected as well.

So tonight, as we look at the opportunities for peace in the former Yugoslavia republic, the debate before us is a simple one: Do we or do we not support the troops as they enter that field of operation?

The Hamilton resolution resolves that the House of Representatives unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States Armed Forces who are carrying out their mission in support of the peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina with professional excellence, dedication, patriotism, and extreme bravery.

General Scowcroft and former U.N. Ambassador Fitzpatrick agree with that posture. They believe that America must fulfill this commitment. But today it seems some would like to have it both ways. They would like to wring their hands about the policy, say that they support the troops, but, on the other hand, take no real action.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the only real action before us that we can consider today and seriously give support to our troops is not one that wrings its hands about the potential dangers that we are all concerned about. But if you read that Resolution 302 that was read, it does not state strong support for our military. I know the Members that voted for it meant to do it, but they have not done it, unless they vote for the Hamilton resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this is the right thing to do tonight. The question of the security and safety of our men is one that will stay with each and every one of us for the time they are in the field. But the right thing to do as they go off is to give them the support of this Congress as this Congress gave its troops support as they entered Desert Storm.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us has been carefully crafted. I urge my colleagues to read it throughout. Although carefully written, I believe it is flawed. Not so much for what it says, but for what it fails to say. It fails to state what a majority of this House believes—that our troops are being deployed on a seriously flawed mission.

We all fully support our troops, strongly unequivocally. The vote we just concluded unmistakably demonstrates that.

I urge our Members not to weaken that message. Accordingly, I submit that the Hamilton resolution is redundant and should be defeated.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, voting whether or not to send American

troops abroad is the most difficult decision that any Member of Congress will ever face.

I still have questions and concerns about our exit strategy and about the dangers our troops will face on the ground in Bosnia. The peace agreement we will help enforce is not perfect. The risks and the dangers are real.

But what is the alternative?

We have all been horrified at the events in Bosnia over the last several years. Mass executions. Torture. Systematic rape. Ethnic cleansing.

For the past 3 years, we called for an end to the horrors. We condemned. We impose sanctions and embargoes. We bombed.

And finally the prestige and the armed might of America brought both sides to the negotiating table to achieve peace.

So what now, now that peace is won?

Will we turn our heads and look the other way as Central Europe descends further into barbarism? Will we shut our eyes to the ethnic cleansing and the genocide? Will we walk away and doom this peace agreement to failure?

We dare not. Make no mistake: Refusal to send United States troops to Bosnia will end the peace. There will be no peace without the leadership of the United States.

Some argue that we have no national interest at stake in Bosnia. I must disagree.

We have a national interest in assisting and supporting our NATO allies. We have a strong national interest in preserving peace in Central Europe. And we have a compelling national interest in stopping ethnic cleansing and genocide.

At stake today is whether the United States will continue to assume a leadership role in the world, or whether we will retreat into isolationism. This debate is about our national character, our moral leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the United States still stands for something very special in this world. Since World War II this Nation has maintained freedom's watch around the globe. We have paid a heavy price for our vigilance—but that is the price we must pay to ensure the success of liberty. We are the world's moral leader—and we must not shirk that leadership.

Our troops are the world's best. They are brave—and they are ready.

Mr. Speaker, we must help bring peace to Bosnia. The United States has the ability to respond, we have the obligation to respond, and we must respond.

Let's support this resolution. Let's support our troops.

□ 2245

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to speak here on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, our foreign policy is flawed. The State Department told us

that the people of Yugoslavia could not get along, so we had to divide Yugoslavia. We set up Croatia, we set up Bosnia and we set up Macedonia. We broke up Yugoslavia because the people there could not get along.

But in Bosnia, the map makers, not unlike the gerrymanderers that ran this place for 40 years, drew an intricate map in Bosnia and said, these people are all going to live under each other and they will live in harmony and peace. And the killing goes on.

And the folks in Sarajevo took a poll, and the Serbians, who comprise about 33 percent of Sarajevo and have for 500 years, said we will not live under the Moslems. So they do not like the plan.

The Mujahedian, who have been imported from the Middle East, 4,000 strong, are there to protect Islam. And they do not care about us and they do not care about the Croatsians and they do not care about the Serbians. They have a different agenda. But our state Department says, we are going to recognize this new central government and, by golly, they are all going to live in peace, and we are going to go there and enforce this peace. It is a flawed foreign policy.

If we really believe these people can live in peace, go back to one Yugoslavia and at least give them some territory, where Croatia, Serbia and the Muslims can live with some distance between them.

We used to have a resolution that said the President has asked us to support his policy and, mysteriously, that was dropped out of the resolution because now we have nothing left but pretty words. Now we say, we, some Members of Congress, have questions. We have reservations.

I cannot get up the first question when I try to make a list of questions, and that is, how the heck do we get out of here? How do we keep from being enmeshed in this quagmire that has gone on for 500 years? How do we save the lives of our young men and women? This Democratic alternative is a fig leaf under any word.

Please vote no.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton resolution, and I think the Members of this body ought to support it, too.

We had our vote on cutting off the funds; and we said we did not want to cut off the funds. Now we are suggesting we are going to send a mixed message. I suggest some in this body want to have it both ways.

We suggest that we want a peace accord that has no risk. If there were no risk, we would not need military troops in Europe; we would certainly not need them in Bosnia.

Surely, there is risk involved in this, but the fact is, we did not start this

foreign policy in November of 1995, such as the resolutions that many Members referred to were initiated at that point. In fact, of course, the commitments in this particular instance, in Bosnia, Yugoslavia, go back to the former administration, and certainly at least 2 years with this administration.

No, the right posture here is to vote for this resolution to provide the type of support and to understand that, indeed, there are risks. There are going to be incidents. There are going to be accidents. We should be very concerned about it, but the goal they are trying to accomplish is a reasonable one and one that this Nation should stand behind, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to support both our peace-meeting troops and the decision to commit them in support of the Bosnian peace agreement. The conflict in Bosnia has brought many images of pain and suffering. Reports indicate that over 200,000 people have been killed in the conflict, mostly civilians as well as military personnel. Millions of people in Bosnia were forced to leave their homes in this war on civilians and cities. In fact an estimated half the population are refugees. Now with American leadership, and the demonstrated re-energized military capacity in Croatia and Bosnia this past spring, negotiations have led to a peace agreement that offers hope to the people of the Balkans. In order to monitor this agreement and create the basis for a lasting peace, the United States and its NATO allies have been asked by the parties involved to contribute a peacekeeping force and have agreed to enforce the peace.

Because of the instability caused by the Balkan conflict, repercussions from a continued conflict go far beyond the Balkans and threaten United States interests in all of Europe, Greece, and Turkey. This area has been freed from the control of communism and now faces the re-emergence of ethnic and religious tensions, and an unpredictable and dangerous nationalism. The harsh conflicts among peoples and nations in this region seriously risk the new found liberty and the hope of a lasting peace. In such a situation, an opportunity to bolster peace cannot be discarded, especially in light of the past 4 years of suffering.

The Dayton peace agreement gives the U.S.-led NATO forces the ability and authority to accomplish their mission of peace. I support this peacekeeping operation as it is truly a peacekeeping mission. Our peacekeeping forces will be in a dangerous environment, but one in which the parties have agreed to a peace settlement. This separates and establishes a distinct difference with the deployments in Lebanon or Somalia, and the Persian Gulf action, which in essence was a full fledged action to repel Iraq.

The Dayton peace agreement provides for the withdrawal of foreign parties, the removal of heavy weapons, and the reduction in the numbers of forces and such material. Important negotiations will further define and limit armaments and armed forces in the region. Hopefully the militaries can be built down to an improved parity; instead of built up for future instability and conflict.

Ironically, the insistence by some to condition their support on United States assurances of supplying and training of the Bosnian Mos-

lems may in fact compromise the neutral role that the United States seeks to offer as peacekeepers. This factor could indeed raise the risks associated with the U.S. peacekeeping role, and that apparent risk initially has caused significant angst by the same Members of Congress who promote the training and supplying proposal. This confuses and tends to contradict the issue they advance.

The decision to send U.S. troops is not one to be taken lightly. Each soldier's life is important, for family, friends, and our Nation. The troops being sent will have the ability to defend themselves. Their training has prepared them for this situation. No doubt there will be accidents and some incidents in which soldiers lives may be lost. I am very concerned but am hopeful that the Dayton protocols will work to prevent the loss of peacekeepers lives.

The mission of peace, given the circumstances shaped with American participation and support, is important and justifies this U.S. peacekeeping role and contribution. U.S. leadership is necessary to move the peace that has been started into a new future for the people of the region. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution offered by Representative Hamilton.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have consumed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky]. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has 19½ minutes and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 15 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

[Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.]

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say why I oppose the well-meaning, but I think flawed resolution of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]. It will be interpreted as fully supporting the President's policy. Even though it does not say so, and wisely so, I think that is the way the press is spinning it, as the Dornan resolution, cut off all the funds, a middle ground expressing opposition but supporting the troops in the Buyer-Skelton resolution; and this is the other edge of the spectrum, namely supporting the President.

But having voted for Buyer-Skelton and having voted for Dornan, mostly I cannot support this because purporting to cover the waterfront, it is very benign as to objections the whole policy. The language is, Whereas some Members of Congress have questions and concerns about certain aspects of the peace implementation process. I do not have questions or concerns, I oppose it, and so do most of the people; in fact, everybody who voted for Buyer-Skelton, because it said, we oppose the policy.

So to say we have questions and concerns is just too mild. It is too gossamer. It just does not cover it. So for that reason, I cannot support it, al-

though otherwise it has good language supporting our troops; but the Buyer-Skelton resolution did that, too.

Now, clearly, Mr. Speaker, I oppose putting 20,000-plus troops in extreme and certain danger during what I believe to be a time-out in a series of wars that have been fueled by ethnic and religious hatreds, spawned centuries ago. But the key to all this is our national interest, our national interest.

Now, somebody has decided our national interest is not at play in Rwanda, even though millions of people have been killed, even though there is no democracy there, but our national interests are not involved. The same thing is true in the Sudan. Millions of people have been killed there, refugees, displacements, starvation, racial and religious hatreds, but our national interests are not involved there.

So that becomes very important. And so we look at Bosnia-Herzegovina and we say, where are our national interests there?

By way of comparison, we look at Desert Storm and our national interests were clearly involved. We had a defined enemy, a potential nuclear power with other weapons of mass destruction out waging an aggressive war against Kuwait and putting at risk the major petroleum reserves in the world in the Persian Gulf. If Kuwait had fallen, Saudi Arabia would have fallen and the economies of the world would have been in the vice-like grip of Saddam Hussein.

So, for me, and I am not a particularly bright fellow, I could see our national interest bristling in that situation. And the President saw it and the President wanted to commit troops over there. But those of us with some institutional memory, not all, I am sure, remember the vote of January 12 of 1991 where we got 86 Democrat votes yes and 179 no, and not one Democrat leader supported President Bush.

I am not going to take the time, Mr. Speaker, to discuss the bills of impeachment, three of them, that were brought against President Reagan and President Bush by various people, as well as litigation. I have the bills of impeachment and I have the complaints in my office. But I would like to note parenthetically that one of the charges in the bill of impeachment against Reagan was the abuse of the United States press in perpetuating a disinformation campaign against Colonel Qadhafi of Libya during the summer of 1986. That, I think, is classic.

In looking over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the debates over Desert Storm, and I grant Members they are not identical at all, one was war and this is peace, sort of. Sort of. We are going in with lots of armament, though, to protect. To enforce, not protect the peace. But our national interests, in my judgment, others may wish what they want or think what they want, were directly involved in Desert Storm.

Let me read from the debate what one of the gentlewomen from Michigan had to say, and I quote, and this is January 12, 1991, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I will give Members the pages if they want them, but here is what she said.

In a time of limited resources to rebuild our cities, feed and house our homeless, educate our young, why is this administration so eager to spend billions in a far-off land that will have no meaningful impact on resolving the social and economic problems confronting every American every day right here at home?

Another gentleman, who was recently a senatorial candidate in the far west, in a primary, says:

Today, a large American force sits uneasily in the Arabian desert. They do not have a clear idea why they are there, the American people do not have a clear idea why they are there, and Congress does not have a clear idea why they are there. Mr. Speaker, if we learned anything from the military misadventures of the last 40 years, it is that U.S. military might should not be committed to battle without a clear statement of U.S. objectives and the broad support of the American people.

Another senatorial candidate from a State very near and dear to me. Here is what he had to say:

I certainly do not know that I could go up and tell someone who has lost a husband that it was more important for this Congress to show unity than patience. But I would hope that this Congress would not squander its constitutional birth right over some ambiguous possibility or partisan loyalty to any President, Democrat or Republican.

The ranking member on the Committee on International Relations was very clear when he said in that debate, "We have a constitutional responsibility to vote at the time when and if the President concludes force is necessary. That decision must be made jointly."

Then we have a gentleman from California, a long-standing member of the Congress, who said, and I quote:

I have not heard any of you say a single thing for which I would vote to send even one American to die. The only valid issue is whether to give Bush authority to order thousands, even tens of thousands to their death. For those who persist, it should suffice to point out the United States is insolvent. To increase our deficit and debt by over \$50 billion should turn the most aggressive warriors away from combat.

Now, we have a man from Massachusetts, who is skilled in the field of telecommunications and others, and very articulate, and here is what he said:

No one could explain to me what the war in Vietnam was all about. I swore then that if I were ever in any position of power, I would do everything I could to assure that before any young persons were asked to lay down his or her life for our country, we would be able to explain to that young man's friends and family the reasons why. So far I have not heard any explanations that would satisfy the loved ones of the new generation who now stand poised to fight in the Persian Gulf. It is a shame.

MODIFICATION TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 306
OFFERED BY MR. HAMILTON

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution

be modified by deleting the preamble and all of the test before the resolved clause so that the resolution be modified by deleting the preamble and all of the text before the resolved clause so that the resolution would simply read, "Resolved, That the House of Representatives unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States Armed Forces who are carrying out their mission in support of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman who objected would permit me to explain why I made the request.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I think we can save a lot of time by saying in the Buyer resolution we have done this.

□ 2300

Mr. HAMILTON. Would the gentleman permit me to explain?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING). Objection is heard.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a wrenching decision. It is a decision that will have to be made this evening in its purest sense. I beg to differ with my colleagues, because they are skating the issue. This is a weighty decision. I can respect the disagreement of colleagues; I cannot accept the hypocrisy.

The gentleman rose just a few minutes ago to ask that we go on record standing here tonight unequivocally supporting the men and women headed to Bosnia. The resolution just passed was one of hypocrisy, albeit I respect the diversity of opinion and certainly do respect all who would not want to put those in harm's way, but nowhere in the Buyer amendment did it say unequivocally, with no question, do we support the troops going to Bosnia.

I do not know about my colleagues, but I am not going home to my constituents, to the American people, for me to tell them that Shane Hadley and Dwayne Case and Jeffrey Burkette, Texans who are on their way to Bosnia, do not have my support.

So, I would ask those who have a difference of opinion than I might have who may have gone to Bosnia, as I did, who may have talked to the people there who said Americans are the only ones who could give peace, and my colleagues may not have gone, I simply say to my colleagues that we have a serious decision to make.

I would ask that my colleagues follow a little child. The Holy Ghost Catholic School, on December 11, in Houston, TX, asked me to join them to pray for our troops. They asked me as a Congresswoman to take their words to this House as they lit candles and prayed. They said, "We support our troops. Will you do that, Congresswomen?" And I said to them, as I said to our troops in Germany, unequivocally, this Congress will go on record.

My colleagues, I ask you to simply put aside the partisan politics. Let us join together and unequivocally support our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my strong support for our young men and women who will be serving in Bosnia. They deserve our utmost support and admiration. They are on a mission of peace that is in the true spirit of what our country was founded on: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

For the past several years, all Americans have been horrified by the atrocities that have occurred in the Balkans. Over this time, many different cease fires and peace agreements have come and gone. We all prayed for a European solution, but none was forthcoming. The time for American leadership has once again arisen.

As the leaders of the free world, we need to be part of maintaining a stable and secure Europe. We stepped in and made a difference in World War I. And, we saved Europe, and the world from tyranny by defeating Hitler in World War II. Now, as the 20th century draws to a close, our Nation must once again enter the European theater and promote freedom. We must learn the lessons of history and speak firmly and act decisively to create a lasting peace.

I was part of the first bipartisan delegation to visit Bosnia, and have seen first hand the devastation there. I was told by the citizens of Sarajevo about the 3.2 million refugees, the over 200,000 people that have been murdered, and the over 6,000 elderly who have been left homeless. I am confident that our military will be able to meet the challenges that will be faced in Bosnia. I am confident because when I personally met with those troops who were in Germany and headed to Bosnia, they said that they were ready. However, they also said to me, "We want the American people behind us." To those troops and the troops from Texas in particular—Shane Hadley, Dwayne Case, Jeffrey Burkette—I promise that I will work for that support.

The peace agreement has been negotiated with NATO as the military enforcer. As the leading power in NATO, and in the world, we have a moral and duty-bound obligation to work with our European allies in ensuring peace in Bosnia. This is not another Vietnam, and our troops will be able to defend themselves. We are the only Nation that has the technology and ability to deploy the large numbers of forces that are necessary to set up a large-scale military operation in a short amount of time. The Germans, the French, the British, and the Belgians have all failed. The citizens of Bosnia want us to help.

As 20,000 American troops prepare to depart for Bosnia, let us give our full support to this mission that is about peace, leadership, and stability. While our troops will work with

soldiers of other NATO countries, they will be under the leadership of an American commander at all times. Some would argue that we must ignore the problems of the world. But I say, let us be a part of a larger battle; the battle for human rights and justice.

I want to applaud the children of the Holy Ghost Catholic School in my home State of Texas who in their wisdom came together December 11 to pray for our troops. The children read letters, praying for peace. That's the true American spirit. I thank them for their courage, sincerity, and love of what America stands for.

We in Congress have a very difficult decision to make tonight, but it is not a decision to send troops to war. It is rather a decision to uphold the ideas of democracy, to stop the shooting and the slaughter; to clear the way for peace.

Like the children of the Holy Ghost School, we should stand up and give our troops our support tonight. And we should pray for peace and pray for the safety of our young men and women.

My colleagues, I implore you to support our troops, support the President, support what is morally right, and above all, put an end to the madness. Support the Hamilton resolution, House Resolution 305.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana knows that I have high regard for him. So I took your last resolved clause, and I personalized it. Because I am going to vote against the amendment, but I am going on the record with a single, "I person" version of your resolved.

"I, Congressman ROBERT K. DORNAN, unequivocally support the 151 men," there are no women in there yet, "of the United States Armed Forces who are carrying out this near-impossible mission in support of temporary peace in a gang fight in Bosnia and Herzegovina with their Reagan-trained professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery, that they will be called upon to show if they start stepping on land mines or start taking sniper fire."

That is about it. I support that. I just came back from the Senate. Only 7 Republicans out of 53 voted against the amendment offered by KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON and JIM INHOFE. Only seven. Mr. Speaker, 46 voted for it, and 1 Democrat who has a tough election coming up.

Over here, the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], 287. That is about as strong a support for the troops as the gentleman from Missouri, IKE SKELTON, whom the troops love, chairman of Subcommittee on Military Personnel, exemplary Member, loves the men and women in uniform. And the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] is not only supporting the troops, he is one of the troops. He has been with them in dangerous areas.

Mr. Speaker, I beg my colleagues tomorrow to get that top intelligence briefing, and I want my colleagues to look at this this way. If you were a young man in Bosnia and you were a

Moslem and you had a country in the United Nations that the United States and the European Union recognized as a nation on April 7, 4 years ago this coming April, and suddenly your country is cleaved in half, partitioned, and your sister was raped for 3 days by 50 people and then set on fire and burned alive, are you going to write it all off and keep the peace? I would not, and neither would my colleagues. And grudges are going to be filled out, these blood debts, after we are gone.

I predict we will keep some sort of a peace for 10½ months and then they will all come home, and Clinton will roll the dice trying to get reelected.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD].

(Mr. POSHARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Hamilton resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Hamilton amendment. The deployment of American troops in Bosnia is a very serious undertaking. It is a very risky action. As policymakers, it is appropriate that we move with reluctance and hesitation, but this serious risky action is a vitally necessary action.

Military criminals, thugs with weapons of mass destruction, should not be allowed to butcher innocent thousands of civilians as they recklessly grab for power. On Tuesday in this Chamber, Prime Minister Shimon Peres of Israel paid tribute to America with the following words:

As the end of this twentieth century is nearing, it can verily be described as the American century. The United States has built strength and used it to save the globe from three of its greatest menaces: Nazi tyranny, Japanese militarism, and the Communist challenge. You saved freedom. You enabled many nations to save their democracies, even as you strive now to assist many nations to free themselves from their nondemocratic past. You fought many wars. You won many victories. Wars did not cause you to lose heart. Triumphs did not corrupt you. You remained unspoiled, because you rejected the spoils of victory.

End of quote by Shimon Peres.

The American people and its armies should not again and again be called upon to make great sacrifices in order to save the civilized world. Our Nation should make it known that American resources and American soldiers will not always be available for every just cause.

But Bosnia, we have a most appropriate time to respond. This is a landmark in modern civilization. Our troops are being deployed within the context of a well-developed blueprint for peace. Our troops are being de-

ployed to smother and contain the virus of ethnic cleansing and racism. Our troops are being deployed to provide an opportunity to survive for hundreds of thousands of grieving men, women, and children. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the Hamilton amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have consumed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has 9½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM].

(Mr. KIM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I have a high respect for our ranking member the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], but I rise in opposition to this resolution.

We are missing the discussion here tonight.

First, it goes without saying that everyone in Congress strongly supports America's troops.

In every speech and in every resolution we have passed about Bosnia, this Congress has gone on record of providing unquestionable support for our troops.

We just passed a resolution with the same language supporting our troops.

This resolution does not address the underlying policy issue. But, while I support our troops, I have serious reservations about the underlying policy that is sending these troops to Bosnia.

By silencing any policy concerns, this resolution is sending a confusing, mixed message. It might be used by some to claim that there is congressional support for this Bosnia questionable adventure. That claim would be totally inaccurate—but they would cite this resolution.

This resolution does not address 3 important questions:

First, why should the United States provide over one-third of all the NATO troops? Many NATO countries are sending as few as 500 troops. Why 20,000 Americans, the lion's share?

Second, why don't we just provide logistical and support troops like Germany—and Germany is only sending 4,000 supporting troops.

Third, why are we sending troops to Bosnia when the American public is overwhelmingly opposed to this operation? In my office alone, the calls are 100 to 4 opposing the deployment of troops.

Again, we all strongly support the troops, it's the policy we question and we cannot afford to send a mixed message as this resolution would surely do.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH].

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I think, unfortunately, some with this obsession to embarrass the President are

going to cause the House to embarrass itself. When the American troops land in Bosnia, there is going to be no doubt by those who face some 20,000 well-armed, well-trained American troops what American policy is. We only confuse ourselves by this action that we are engaged in this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would support the resolution in front of us. It is difficult to understand the contradiction where we could stand and give a round of applause to the Prime Minister of Israel as he talked about taking risks for peace, and then given our own opportunity here this evening, we would muffle our message about what our role is in Bosnia.

The President has taken the leadership. This Congress has refused to eliminate funds for those troops. Therefore, the result is that our troops are going to be there. They are there to enforce a peace and that peace is well worthy of the best of America's efforts.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the Hamilton resolution, not because those who are supporting it voted against the Defense Appropriations Act, but I am voting against it because it is going to be misinterpreted as supporting the President's policy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support the President's policy. I sat in Zagreb in a hotel after being in Bosnia, in Sarajevo, and I talked to Marine Lt. Col. Mark Sifford and his wife, Marianne. They have 3 children. He is going to spend his Christmas in Sarajevo away from his family. The question that his children have are, "Why is Daddy not going to be home?" Why are we sending our parents of these kids at Christmas-time to a war-torn country? What is the reason? What is the vital American interest? Why are we defending this?

I think there are many ways to lead the world, but sending our men and women is not one of them. We can lead in many ways.

Mr. Speaker, I have with me this coin from the 1st Armored Division. It was given to me by Sgt. Kempton Watson. He has a mother that has been crippled by a car accident. He is the only son that she has. We are sending American sons to defend them. It is a failed policy. I oppose the policy. Vote against Hamilton, because it will be misinterpreted.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

□ 2315

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, in a few moments when this debate ends, the lights are dimmed across the country, thousands of American families are still going to sit in fear for those they love who are in our Armed Forces.

They need to know that we are a proud and a very grateful Nation. They also need to understand the historic nature of this mission.

When the 20th century concludes, Mr. Speaker, we will close the chapter on nearly 300 wars. Despite all of our science and our culture and the advances of our times, this has been the most deadly period of human history. Our troops go to Bosnia to preserve the peace, to end the genocide, but also because they are the best hope that the future is going to be different from the past. In the Persian Gulf we proved that the world could fight together for justice. In Bosnia we proved that we can stand together to preserve the peace.

Mr. Speaker, we all wish that it could be different. But the lessons of European wars still burn in our memory. And there have been too many nights in too many churches and too many synagogues where we prayed that never again would the world experience genocide. Now we are left with the question, did all of that have meaning? Those memories stay with us for a reason. Yet my colleagues argue that it is not fair, it is not right that America should bear the burden.

Mr. Speaker, it has never been fair. It was not fair in Flanders. It was not fair in Okinawa or Normandy.

Mr. Speaker, we are not everybody else. We are Americans. We have never accepted history. We have changed it. Others might accept 250,000 people dying in their homelands. Other people might see genocide and slaughter and learn to look away. We are different. That is a difference that I am grateful for every day.

The determination of those who sat in this Chamber before us, colleagues who were here before us, led to a triumph of democracy in the world in the 20th century. My colleagues, if we have the same determination, if we have the same strength, we can lead to the triumph of peace in the 21st century. That judgment, Mr. Speaker, holds in the balance.

Mark Twain once said that in a world where physical courage is so common, it is tragic that moral courage should be so rare. Our troops have the physical courage to answer the call of our Nation. In the Hamilton resolution we determine whether we have the moral courage to lead, whether, indeed, Mr. Speaker, we are equal to those who answer the call of our country tonight.

I urge support of the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, this measure asks us to ignore the policy. My colleagues, how can we ignore the policy? How can we ignore this ultimate policy failure of this administration and this President? How can we ignore the failed policy of Somalia that turned a humanitarian mission into a nation-building fiasco that left dozens of Americans dead and United States taxpayers still paying billions?

How can we ignore the failed policy of Haiti, where we sailed into Port-au-Prince Harbor, retreated, imposed an embargo on the poorest of the poor, sat by while the opposition was exterminated? We destroyed any shred of the economy and we spent and we are spending billions and billions, only to watch 1,100 flee just in the last few weeks and dozens die at sea because of our policy. And we are still paying billions.

How can we tonight ignore the failed policy of Rwanda where this administration ignored Butros Bugalis who begged and pleaded for action to avoid a slaughter of three-quarters of a million people and they died. And then we sent troops and then we spent millions.

How can we tonight deny and ignore a failed policy where for 3 years Bosnians begged us to change our policy? This week is Sarajevo, a Bosnian leader said to me, we did not ask for your troops. We asked for the policy to allow us to defend ourselves.

Where was our policy when 12,000 Sarajevo men, women and children were slaughtered? I saw the countless graves across the landscape of Sarajevo just in the last few days and another quarter of a million people were killed in the Balkans. Where was our policy?

Bosnians ask me, where was our policy when the U.N. told Bosnian citizens at Srebrenica to lay down their arms and their women and children are slaughtered. How tonight can we ignore this policy?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 6 minutes remaining and has the right to close, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

(Mr. COLEMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, because this Congress must stand for a clear policy, I rise in support of the President's policy to keep the peace in Bosnia, and I rise in support of the Hamilton resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday night near midnight, I said goodbye to several dozen soldiers from my district leaving their families to go to Bosnia. It was not easy. It was not easy for me to say to them face to face that I had serious reservations about this mission.

To their credit, they were not bothered by that admission from me. Because I said one thing they could count on is just as Congress after a vote on Desert Storm came together and in support of our soldiers, you could be assured that Congress, after our votes on conscience, would come together to support our troops.

Yet I am ashamed that because of the action of one Republican Member of this House tonight we will be denied the opportunity to show unanimous support for our troops.

Let me read to the American people what that one Member kept us from being able to vote on tonight.

Resolved that the House of Representatives unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States armed forces who are carrying out their mission in support of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery.

It is shameful we will not have the opportunity to vote on that tonight.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the earlier proponents of the President's policy used the word "hypocrisy" when referring to some of the statements on the Republican side of the House. The word "hypocrisy" called to attention something of interest to me; that is, how do we really support the American troops?

The real vote in supporting the American troops, the soldiers of our Nation, wherever they might be, came when we voted on the appropriations bill to pay for their training, to pay for their technology, to pay their salaries, their health care, their educational benefits, their quality of life. That is where we voted to support the American troops.

Hypocrisy, one after the other on this side who come here now to support the President's policy, most of them are the very Members who voted against funding training, technology, quality of life for our troops, and refused to support the troops, but they want to send them to Bosnia to get involved in a war.

Another of the speakers mentioned history. Let me say something about history. I read a statement to the President in the Cabinet Room a short time ago at a meeting. Subsequently that same day my distinguished minority leader read the same statement on the floor. Let me read it again just for a few seconds.

No language can describe adequately the condition of that large portion of the Balkan peninsula, Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, and other provinces, political intrigues, constant rivalries, a total absence of all public spirit, hatred of all races, animosities of rival religions and an absence of any controlling power, nothing short of an army of 50,000 of the best troops would produce anything like order in these parts.

History, my colleagues. That was said by British Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli in the House of Lords in August 1878, and history proved his wisdom.

Pray God that history does not prove this a disaster with Americans in Bosnia. We support our troops wherever they might be.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to oppose this resolution. Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke told me that to get this treaty signed he had to twist arms.

There is a statement in this resolution that is at the heart of my objections to the treaty. That has to do with full cooperation. As earlier this evening I said, after my visit to Bosnia, I had some serious reservations about the commitment. My impression is that there is a difference of commitment by the signers of this treaty on how to handle the refugees.

My impression is that there is clearly unhappiness by the participants about the territorial provisions. My impression is that there is major disagreement that will lead to significant lack of cooperation related to the rearming of the Bosnian Serbs.

Maybe this is why President Milosevic over cocktails with the Assistant Secretary, is quoted in the news magazines as saying, "Richard, you are a BS artist."

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could stand here and support my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana. I cannot because his resolution obfuscates the issue. I can understand also why my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] came to the floor here upset because he also understands that all these whereas clauses in the Hamilton resolution makes it a flawed resolution. That is why so many are upset here today. This is not just one of these issues of just support the troops. This bill has a lot of flawed statements in it. We understand that.

Let me share with my colleagues, we have voted on this issue. We just voted on it. Let me tell Members what it says. It says that this Congress is confident that members of the U.S. armed forces in who it has the greatest pride and admiration will perform their responsibilities with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary courage.

We have just voted to support these troops. We will support these troops. We grow the defense budgets and provide for them every day and we will continue to do that in the future.

Do not support this resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. GEPHARDT], minority leader.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I simply wanted to explain why I was offering the unanimous consent that I did. The objection on the other side of the aisle has been that our resolution sent a mixed message, implied support, was redundant, obfuscated. None of those charges have been spelled out in language, but I take them as genuine concerns on the part of the other side.

□ 2330

So I wanted to strip all of that out and leave simply the language of unequivocal support.

Now, the striking thing about the Buyer-Skelton amendment is that the word support does not appear in it. Expressing confidence in the troops is not the same the Congress supporting the troops. If we finish our work tonight with the Buyer-Skelton resolution adopted and the Hamilton resolution defeated, we will have not supported the troops by a specific resolution of this Congress.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, who served 6½ years in a prison in Vietnam.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. First of all, let me say to my friend from Missouri, I did vote for the appropriations bill, so what I say is with that kind of support to the troops.

I served in Vietnam for a long time. I did not have a unanimous or, if you will, magnanimous, unequivocal support from this Congress while I served in Vietnam. The troops that are going to Bosnia will not have one either because of one objection. We have missed an opportunity to do a bipartisan, unequivocal support of our troops in Bosnia.

The only thing, incidentally, that General Crouch asked us to give him when we were in Freiburg, we asked what can we do for you? He said "Give me something I can give to my troops that says you support them."

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to clarify, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] said there was nothing in the Buyer resolution to show support. On page 4 of that resolution, it says, " * * * is furnished the resources and support that he needs to ensure the safety, support, and well-being of such members of the Armed Forces."

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me say to the Members tonight, I think we have gone up and down the hill of whether this says support. The real important vote tonight was whether or not we would cut off the funds, and I know there were many Members in the body that voted to do that. I respect their vote.

Once that decision was made, we then had a resolution which set out

people's concerns about what was happening and did, I agree, set out a measure of support for the troops.

Our intent in presenting this resolution was not to change the editorial content, not to go back over the decision of whether or not we would cut off the funds but, as we did after the Persian Gulf debate in 1991, try to get a bipartisan, unanimous if we could, expression of this body that we support the troops, so that the people in the field leading the troops could have a piece of paper that would say unequivocally that the people of the United States, however they may be divided on what was happening and how it was happening, supported, without question, what they were doing.

We passed almost identical wording in 1991, 399 to 6. And I would ask the gentleman from Indiana, if we have an opportunity before we quit, to ask unanimous consent again, and I would ask the Members who wanted to object to rethink it, because I think it would be a good thing for us as a Congress tonight to say to our people there, who will be in harm's way, everybody agrees, we hope no one dies, we hope no one is injured, but that Congress in a bipartisan way wants to unequivocally say tonight, after all of our disputes have been settled one way or the other, that we stand behind our troops.

Let me just say one thing in closing, and then I will try to get out of the way so the gentleman can perhaps try to do this again. Alexis de Tocqueville once talked about America's morality. He said this:

I sought for the greatness and generosity of America in her commodious harbors and ample rivers, and it was not there. I sought for it in her democratic Congress and her matchless Constitution, and it was not there. Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits flame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her generosity and power. America is a great country because she is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, this is a good country, and it is a great country, and for all of our differences tonight on what is happening, we have made a choice not to stop this deployment. I ask the Members to try to come together tonight in a bipartisan way and in an unequivocal way to say to our troops, however we may differ about what is happening, we stand behind each of you through every minute and day of this great exercise.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]. No member of this body takes lightly the decision to place the lives of American troops at risk. In this case, I believe President Clinton has done his best to minimize the risk and there is strong justification for joining the NATO peacekeeping force.

People in the Balkan region have suffered greatly over the last 4 years as a result of the Bosnian conflict. In the quiet of our living rooms, we have seen and read about many of the horrors of the war. The killing of civilians,

mass executions, and shortages of food, shelter, and other basic necessities have evoked outrage and sympathy from around the world.

Over the past few months, United States negotiators have succeeded in persuading the warring parties in Bosnia to agree to a peace plan. Now is not the time to turn our backs on the important role we play in the success of this agreement. The parties have agreed to tough compromises, yet it is the presence of the NATO peace implementation force that gives each party the confidence that the others will uphold their parts of the agreement. The United States must join its NATO allies in an effort to give the people of Bosnia the chance to peacefully coexist, build a democracy, and ensure that the horrors of war do not reoccur.

The United States has a vital interest in ensuring that peace in the region is sustained. Renewed war would not only exacerbate the suffering of the Bosnian people, the conflict could spread to nearby nations. Expansion of the war may draw us into a future conflict that requires a greater U.S. commitment—one which might not be limited to a peacekeeping role.

As a leader in the world and NATO, the United States must show willingness to work with our allies. Our participation in NATO has contributed to stability in Europe and to our victory in the cold war. NATO is an integrated military structure whose effectiveness depends on the United States, its largest member. Neglecting our leadership role in efforts to end the Bosnian conflict could erode our standing with our international partners and call into question our commitment to longstanding allies. We cannot afford to undermine those alliances.

The safety of U.S. military personnel on this mission is of paramount importance. I have been impressed with the administration's efforts to pursue a peace agreement that our military could implement and enforce. The mission has been narrowly defined and the President has ensured that the troops will be able to react with force if threatened. While there are risks to this mission, efforts have been made to minimize the possibility of harm.

We are all aware of the atrocities committed in this war. The United States has been actively involved in the peace process. Participation in the NATO peacekeeping is a final step we must take to give the parties in the Bosnian conflict a chance to live in peace.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker; I rise in support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]. This well-considered resolution offers unequivocal support for the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces as they prepare to carry out their mission in Bosnia.

My colleagues, over the last 4 years, more than half of Bosnia's prewar population has been murdered, starved, or driven out of their homes. With American leadership, a cease-fire has finally been brokered which will bring an end to Bosnia's suffering.

The Hamilton resolution acknowledges the questions and concerns that many members of the House have about this policy, but it affirms congressional support for our troops.

If we fail to keep our commitment in Bosnia, the credibility of our leadership elsewhere in Europe and throughout the world will be called into question.

I urge my colleagues to support our troops in Europe by supporting the Hamilton resolution.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the Hamilton resolution on American troops in Bosnia.

My decision on what is the proper course of action for the United States to take in this Balkan conflict is the most difficult one I have faced since coming to Congress. I have searched my conscience to do what is best for my country, understanding that many of my constituents do not support American troops in the Balkans.

I have been horrified by the violations of human rights that have taken place in Bosnia—the ethnic cleansing, the concentration camps, the rapes, the mass murders, the wanton military attacks against unarmed civilians.

At the same time, I could not support the provision of American arms for the Bosnian Moslems or Croats, because I feared it would lead to more killings, more disregard for human rights and human life.

This is a crisis that has defied easy answers. If there were a simple solution to bringing this bloodshed to an end, our European allies would have accomplished it.

They were not able to bring an end to this war and, as a result, the United States has led the effort for peace, bringing the parties in conflict, at their request, to the negotiating table.

The President, in his capacity as Commander in Chief has exercised his constitutional authority. The Congress will now decide whether or not we will support American Troops, already being deployed on the Ground.

American troops deserve the unequivocal support of the Congress in this effort for peace, for peace, not war.

I recognize fully that there are risks attendant to this peace mission, but the United States of America must be on the side of peace and lead—demonstrate to the world that we can and will live up to our great heritage and place a moral force for peace on the blood-stained soil of the Balkans. The pursuit of peace must rise above the pursuit of reelection.

Two of the resolutions before us tonight do not provide complete support for American troops. The Dornan resolution purports to back our peacekeepers, but refuses to give them funds to do their job. The Buyer/Skelton resolution expresses confidence in our forces but undercuts the justification for their deployment.

Anything less than our total commitment to backing the women and men of the United States Armed Forces at a time when they are trying to bring peace to Bosnia injects politics, not statesmanship. While the United States of America cannot be a policeman of the world, we cannot be bystanders either. The exhortation "Blessed are the peacemakers" moves me to support this effort.

Only the Hamilton resolution expresses our support clearly and without reservation and I support it.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, tonight America stands at a crossroads. Tonight we must decide whether we are going to honor our global commitments and responsibilities, or are we going to retreat into the muddy waters of isolationism, turning our back on our friends and allies. Tonight, Mr. Speaker, this body

must decide if we are going to stand firmly behind our troops or are we going to point fingers and make a stance for political gain?

The choice is simple, Mr. Speaker, tonight we must act to honor our global commitments and stand firmly behind our American troops.

Mr. Speaker, the case for United States military involvement in Bosnia is clear, it is compelling, and it is credible. First, the Dayton Peace Accord is an American brokered peace agreement. Failure by the United States to participate in enforcing this agreement will greatly diminish American leadership and call into question the viability of NATO. Second, faith in our democratic ideals obliges us to act. Over 250,000 men, women, and children have died in this war, while 2 million more have been forced into becoming refugees through "ethnic cleansing" and torture. Third, American troops will make up one-third of a much larger contingent of British, French, German, Russian, and other troops whose mission it will be to enforce a peace agreement that the Presidents of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia have willingly entered into. Accordingly, the risk to these troops will be much less than if they were being used as combatants to militarily impose an American solution. Fourth, American participation now, will prevent the war from reigniting and spreading into neighboring NATO allies and struggling new democracies. Widespread conflict in Europe would threaten our security and require a far different and more costly American intervention in the future.

At stake, Mr. Speaker, is nothing less than the ability of the United States to influence, shape, and guide the complex forces that are tearing at the seams of not only the United States, but of the world. For, make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, a failure of the United States to share in the burden of enforcing the peace in Bosnia will be a direct abrogation of American leadership—leadership, that we have earned through the sweat and blood of hundreds of thousands of our young men and women, who died and sacrificed so that we may know peace and prosperity.

However, as I have said before, placing the lives of American soldiers at risk is something that should never be done lightly. They are the living embodiment of our collective desires and dreams for a better tomorrow. As the symbolic custodians of the public will, this body has an obligation to ensure that these young men and women are supported and that they are given the very best chance to successfully fulfill their mission. The Dayton Peace Accord does these things.

Mr. Speaker, Bosnia is a test. It is a test of our willingness to lead in an uncertain world. And, it is a test of our commitment to our NATO and Russian allies.

Some of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, will argue that the conflict in Bosnia does not threaten our vital national security interests sufficiently enough to merit risking the lives of 25,000 American soldiers. But, I ask, who among us, Mr. Speaker, does not believe that the viability and vitality of NATO as an entity will be called into question if the United States fails to act now, at this crucial period in our history when Europe is experiencing its most brutal conflict since World War II? Who among us does not believe that our enemies will be emboldened to act in the face of American inaction and indecision? Who among us, Mr. Speaker, believes that the United States will

be able to influence and coerce other nations to act when we ourselves are unwilling to commit our own sons and daughters?

Mr. Speaker, leadership requires much more than words—it demands action. Through American-led NATO airstrikes and consistent American diplomacy, the Presidents of Serbia, Bosnia and Croatia came to Dayton, OH, to pursue peace. It is that peace agreement that we must now act to enforce. History has taught us that in the absence of American leadership and involvement in Europe, aggressive regimes rise to threaten, not only the security of European neighbors, but our own vital national security interests. American inaction now, Mr. Speaker, will without doubt bring to an end the fragile peace that we are now witnessing blossom in Bosnia. Have we forgotten the horrible pictures of the malnourished and underclothed men waiting to die in the concentration camps spread across the remains of Yugoslavia? Have we forgotten the testimony of the thousands of women who were viciously raped or helplessly watched as their young sons, brothers, husbands, or fathers were dragged from their homes and villages never to be seen again? By doing nothing, Mr. Speaker, do we condemn these people to relive the horror of the past 4 years? Peace is at hand, Mr. Speaker, and leadership demands that we act to protect and foster it.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Bosnia is a test. But, it is a test that we can and we must pass! The political and military objectives are clear. Unlike Vietnam, American troops will not be acting to militarily impose an American solution, but rather, they will be working in tandem with 40,000 Russian, British, French, German, and other European troops over a limited timeframe to enforce the terms of a negotiated peace—a peace that the Presidents of Bosnia, Serbia, and Croatia, have agreed upon. Neither, Mr. Speaker will our forces suffer the same fate as the United Nations Protection Force—left ineffective and ultimately irrelevant, unable to defend themselves let alone protect United Nations designated safe areas. Our forces and their European and Russian counterparts will have the military capability and authority to repel any threats to their security or violations of the Peace Agreement.

Further, Mr. Speaker, American troops will not be asked to mediate a centuries-old ethnic conflict, rather, we are intervening with our allies at the behest of the warring parties themselves, to conclude this most recent and bloodiest chapter of that conflict. Through our actions, we are giving the Bosnians, Serbs, and Croats time and space to nurture and foster peace. It is incumbent upon them to build upon this peace and shape a society in which different ethnicities and religious beliefs are seen as strengths and are embraced, rather than as weaknesses and rejected.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, let us not, in our rightful concentration on our own domestic problems, abrogate our global responsibilities and leadership. Let us not, Mr. Speaker, forget about the 250,000 Bosnians, Serbs, and Croats who have lost their lives in this bloody conflict and the countless others who have been wounded or have been forced to flee their homes because of ethnic cleansing. Let us not, in our desire to protect our brave sons and daughters, allow this war to spread beyond its current constraints and threaten Macedonia or Greece. Let us not, Mr. Speaker, forget about the lessons of history that have

taught us to carefully guard ourselves against naive calls for isolationism. For we have learned, through the sweat and blood of our young men and women that freedom is not free and leadership requires more than words—it demands action.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution offered by Mr. HAMILTON to express the support of Congress for the United States troops who will be deployed to Bosnia.

The deployment of U.S. troops is one of the most solemn and difficult decisions a country must make. Even when the mission is not to do battle but to preserve peace as is the case in Bosnia, the deployment of our Armed Forces involves inherent risk. No President and no Member of Congress could ever lightly consider the question of sending U.S. soldiers overseas in support of our national interests.

I would have preferred that the implementation of the Bosnian peace accord would not have required the deployment of U.S. troops. However, the President has made the commitment of our forces and, tonight, several hundred United States troops are in Bosnia and several thousand more are on their way. The choice for the House is whether to support those troops and the mission they seek to accomplish.

In my view, the Hamilton resolution is the only option before us that provides clear and unambiguous support for the brave American men and women who will be serving in Bosnia. While acknowledging that members of Congress continue to have concerns about the implementation of the Dayton Peace Accord, the Hamilton motion says that our soldiers deserve the unequivocal support of the U.S. Congress and the American people. Only the Hamilton motion sets aside the differences in policy that have brought us to this point and simply tells our troops that we support you and the job you are being called to do.

The actions of this House have real consequences for both our foreign policy and our troops who will serve in Bosnia. If we reject our proud tradition of bipartisanship in foreign relations, we will dishearten our friends and embolden our enemies. If, as some suggest, we say to U.S. troops that we support you as individuals but reject the job you are trying to do, it is an empty gesture. What's worse, an equivocating message from Congress that calls into question U.S. resolve threatens U.S. troops by encouraging isolated rogue elements who would resort to violence to derail the peace agreement.

I urge my colleagues to support the Hamilton resolution.

MODIFICATION TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 306
OFFERED BY MR. HAMILTON

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be modified by deleting the preamble and all of the text before the resolved clause, so that the resolution would simply read "Resolved, that the House of Representatives unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States Armed Forces who are carrying out their mission in support of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. On page 3 of the Buyer resolution, it says without any equivocation that the House of Representatives declares; Second, it is confident that the members of the U.S. Armed Forces, in whom it has the greatest pride and admiration, will perform their responsibilities with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary courage.

Paragraph number 4 was written by the staff of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], and that has already been referred to earlier. We have covered this over and over.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER of California. Reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the Buyer-Skelton resolution which specifically puts the Congress of the United States on record in support of the troops. The gentleman correctly points out that we express confidence in those troops, and that is an important thing to do. In the clause mentioned by my friend, the gentlemen from New York [Mr. GILMAN], where he uses the word "support" a couple of times, that refers not to the Congress, but to the President and the Secretary of Defense ensuring that the commander of U.S. forces that are deployed in and around the republic, that they are furnished resources and support. That does not put the Congress on record in support.

My friends, I think this is an important matter. We have troops in the field. We have all kinds of differences in this body about the policy. They have been very well debated in this institution today. But I beg you, let us conclude on a unanimous note with a simple support of the troops. We will strip out all other language that raises questions for Members on the other side.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, respectfully reclaiming my time, both paragraph 4 which the gentleman read and which mentions "support" three times, on line 4, page 3, the House of Representatives declares that. Then it goes to four and says it supports, supports, supports.

I am very respectful of the gentleman's original resolution which states the following: "Whereas the President has asked the people and the Congress of the United States to support the placement of United States Armed Forces on the ground," et cetera.

The gentleman rightfully struck that. That was the original intent of this resolution, sir, not thanking the troops. The Buyer resolution thanks the troops.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to my friend from Indiana, and this perhaps has already been pointed out, but line 20 on page 3 says the President and Secretary of Defense should rely on the judgment of the commander of the United States Armed Forces deployed in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in all matters affecting the safety, support, and well-being of such members of the Armed Forces.

Then, four, the President and the Secretary of Defense should ensure the commander of the U.S. Armed Forces that are deployed in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina are furnished the resources and support that he needs to ensure the safety, support and well-being of such members of the Armed Forces.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the greatest way to support our troops would have been to keep them home. We lost that by five votes.

Mr. Speaker, I object. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, does any Member of the House of Representatives who supports the troops in this matter have the right to seek modification, such that he or she could make a representation that they wish to request unanimous consent that we do exactly what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] set forth?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow morning the first order of business be the Senate resolution sponsored by the majority leader, Mr. DOLE.

Mr. FRISA. Mr. Speaker, I object. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the objector has to stand so we know who it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman who objected will please stand.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FRISA] stood.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, point of order. The gentleman did not stand and object. He sat and objected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FRISA] objected.

Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 304, the previous question is ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 237, answered "present" 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 858]
YEAS—190

Ackerman	Gutierrez	Obey
Baesler	Hall (OH)	Olver
Baldacci	Hall (TX)	Ortiz
Barcia	Hamilton	Orton
Barrett (WI)	Harman	Owens
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Beilenson	Hefner	Pastor
Bentsen	Hilliard	Payne (NJ)
Berman	Hinchev	Payne (VA)
Bevill	Holden	Pelosi
Bishop	Houghton	Peterson (FL)
Bonior	Hoyer	Peterson (MN)
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Pickett
Boucher	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Brewster	Johnson (SD)	Poshard
Brown (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Brown (FL)	Johnston	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Reed
Cardin	Kaptur	Richardson
Castle	Kennedy (MA)	Rivers
Chapman	Kennedy (RI)	Roemer
Clay	Kennelly	Rose
Clayton	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Clement	King	Rush
Clyburn	Kleczka	Sabo
Coleman	Klink	Sawyer
Collins (IL)	LaFalce	Schroeder
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Schumer
Condit	Levin	Scott
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Coyne	Lincoln	Sisisky
de la Garza	Livingston	Skaggs
DeLauro	Lofgren	Slaughter
Dellums	Lowe	Spratt
Deutsch	Luther	Stark
Dicks	Maloney	Stenholm
Dingell	Manton	Stokes
Dixon	Markey	Studds
Doggett	Martinez	Stupak
Dooley	Mascara	Tanner
Doyle	Matsui	Tejeda
Durbin	McCarthy	Thompson
Edwards	McDermott	Thornton
Engel	McHale	Thurman
Eshoo	McIntosh	Torres
Evans	McKinney	Torricelli
Farr	McNulty	Towns
Fattah	Meehan	Velazquez
Fazio	Meek	Vento
Fields (LA)	Menendez	Visclosky
Filner	Mfume	Volkmer
Flake	Miller (CA)	Ward
Foglietta	Minge	Waters
Ford	Mink	Watt (NC)
Frost	Moakley	Waxman
Furse	Mollohan	Williams
Gejdenson	Moran	Wilson
Gephardt	Morella	Wolf
Geren	Murtha	Woolsey
Gibbons	Nadler	Wyden
Gilchrest	Neal	Wynn
Gonzalez	Nethercutt	Yates
Green	Ney	
Gunderson	Oberstar	

NAYS—237

Abercrombie	Bonilla	Coble
Allard	Bono	Coburn
Andrews	Browder	Collins (GA)
Archer	Brownback	Combest
Armey	Bryant (TN)	Cooley
Bachus	Bryant (TX)	Costello
Baker (CA)	Bunn	Cox
Baker (LA)	Bunning	Cramer
Ballenger	Burr	Crane
Barr	Burton	Crapo
Barrett (NE)	Buyer	Creameans
Bartlett	Callahan	Cubin
Barton	Calvert	Cunningham
Bass	Camp	Danner
Bereuter	Canady	Davis
Bilbray	Chabot	Deal
Bilirakis	Chambliss	DeFazio
Bliley	Chenoweth	DeLay
Blute	Christensen	Diaz-Balart
Boehler	Chrysler	Dickey
Boehner	Clinger	Doolittle

Dornan	Jones	Rogers
Dreier	Kasich	Rohrabacher
Duncan	Kelly	Ros-Lehtinen
Dunn	Kim	Roth
Ehlers	Kingston	Roukema
Ehrlich	Klug	Royce
Emerson	Knollenberg	Salmon
English	Kolbe	Sanders
Ensign	LaHood	Sanford
Everett	Largent	Saxton
Ewing	Latham	Scarborough
Fawell	LaTourrette	Schaefer
Fields (TX)	Laughlin	Schiff
Flanagan	Lazio	Seastrand
Foley	Leach	Sensenbrenner
Forbes	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg
Fowler	Lewis (KY)	Shaw
Fox	Lightfoot	Shays
Frank (MA)	Linder	Shuster
Franks (CT)	Lipinski	Skeen
Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo	Skelton
Frelinghuysen	Longley	Smith (MI)
Frisa	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Funderburk	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Galleghy	Martini	Smith (WA)
Ganske	McCollum	Solomon
Gekas	McCrery	Souder
Gilman	McDade	Spence
Goodlatte	McHugh	Stearns
Goodling	McKeon	Stockman
Gordon	Metcalf	Stump
Goss	Meyers	Talent
Graham	Mica	Tate
Greenwood	Miller (FL)	Tauzin
Gutknecht	Molinari	Taylor (MS)
Hancock	Montgomery	Taylor (NC)
Hansen	Moorhead	Thomas
Hastert	Myers	Thornberry
Hastings (WA)	Myrick	Tiahrt
Hayes	Neumann	Torkildsen
Hayworth	Norwood	Traficant
Hefley	Nussle	Upton
Heineman	Oxley	Vucanovich
Herger	Packard	Waldholtz
Hilleary	Parker	Walker
Hobson	Paxon	Walsh
Hoekstra	Petri	Wamp
Hoke	Pombo	Watts (OK)
Horn	Porter	Weldon (FL)
Hostettler	Portman	Weldon (PA)
Hunter	Pryce	Weller
Hutchinson	Quillen	White
Hyde	Quinn	Whitfield
Inglis	Radanovich	Wicker
Istook	Ramstad	Wise
Jacobs	Regula	Young (FL)
Johnson (CT)	Riggs	Zeliff
Johnson, Sam	Roberts	Zimmer

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bateman

NOT VOTING—4

Gillmor Tucker
McInnis Young (AK)

So the resolution was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on resolutions concerning Bosnia considering this evening.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

OPPOSING THE NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT OF 1995

(Mr. ENSIGN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to talk about House Resolution 1020, the nuclear waste issue for a deep repository and interim storage that will be located in Nevada. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1020 busts the Federal budget. I have a letter here from the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, chairman of the Committee on the Budget, which says he will not give a budget waiver to this bill. The importance of that is because this bill does bust the Federal budget by over \$4 billion in the next 7 years.

This bill has many other things that are wrong with it, but right now we are waging the biggest budget debate in anybody's recent memory on the budget in the United States. This would be a totally inappropriate time to go busting the budget by an additional \$4 billion when we are trying to balance the Federal budget in the next 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I must oppose severely, for the people of the State of Nevada, this bill which will target Yucca Mountain and nuclear waste in Nevada.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter from the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,

December 8, 1995.

Hon. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you regarding H.R. 1020, the "Integrated Spent Nuclear Fuel Management Act of 1995". In its present form the bill violates the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and could trigger automatic cuts in key entitlement programs under pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) requirements.

As you are probably aware, H.R. 1020 is designed to establish an interim nuclear waste storage facility at Yucca Mountain, Nevada as well as set up procedures for the eventual development of a permanent high-level radioactive waste storage site. I am concerned with Section 401(a)(2) of the bill that replaces the current mandatory fee paid by electric utilities for nuclear waste disposal with a discretionary fee that could vary subject to the level of appropriations provided for the program.

As currently written, the bill violates Section 311(a) of the Budget Act by providing new budget authority rules in excess of the levels set forth in the conference report accompanying H. Con. Res. 67. This bill, in the absence of further legislative action, would increase budget authority by \$585 million in

fiscal year 1996 and approximately \$3.0 billion over the five year period from fiscal year 1996 through 2000.

By changing the nuclear waste disposal fee from mandatory to discretionary, a PAYGO (Section 252 of the Deficit Control Act of 1985) issue arises. The nuclear waste disposal fee change results in approximately \$600 million per year in foregone offsetting receipts, a loss of \$4.2 billion over the period from fiscal year 1996 through 2002. Absent other legislation, this could trigger a sequester of critical mandatory spending programs.

Furthermore, unless the discretionary spending caps are reduced, this legislation could increase the amount that can be spent under the discretionary spending caps. Increased discretionary spending would lead to higher budget deficits. This would occur because the measure authorizes offsetting collections, and the income generated by these offsetting collections creates room under the discretionary spending caps as set forth in current law for increased spending.

During our negotiations with the Administration, we have emphasized the need to reduce spending in order to achieve a balanced budget. I am concerned that passage of this bill in its current form would send the wrong signal to the Administration.

Thank you for your consideration, and I look forward to working with you to solve the problems in this bill.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. KASICH,
Chairman.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the bill from the House (H.R. 2606) "An Act to prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense from being used for the deployment on the ground of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of any peacekeeping operation, or as part of any implementation force, unless funds for such deployment are specifically appropriated by law" did fail to pass the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution concerning the Deployment of United States Armed Forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote No. 844 on December 7, 1995, Pearl Harbor day, and consequently missed the vote on the conference report for VA-HUD appropriations. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."